

Rewrite the paragraph which begins at page 5, line 17 as follows:

28 ~~--~~The above mentioned advantages, as well as further advantages and feature of the present invention, will become more apparent hereinafter from the following detailed disclosure of a preferred embodiment of the melt-blowing head according to the invention which are illustrated, by way of an exemplary but not limitative example, in the figures of the accompanying drawings, where:--

IN THE CLAIMS

Cancel claims 1 to 8 and add the following new claims 9 to 11.

29 9. (new) A melt-blowing head for producing fibrils of a polymeric material in particular for making non-woven fabrics, said melt-blowing head comprising at least a polymeric material inlet channel and a melt-blowing die with a plurality of holes for extruding fibrils therefrom, said melt-blowing head further comprising a channel arrangement for distributing said polymeric material from said inlet channel to each said hole of said melt-blowing die, said channel arrangement comprising a tree construction extending from said polymeric material inlet channel and having a plurality of tree branches each of which ends at a respective hole of said die, wherein said branches have substantially like L-shape and a same size, thereby said polymeric material is held in each said branch for an equal holding time.

10. (new) A melt-blowing head according to Claim 9, wherein at an end of each middle branch of said channel arrangement, said channel arrangement opens into two secondary side branches, having like L-shape and size.

11. (new) A melt-blowing head according to Claim 9, wherein said melt-blowing head comprises three different inlets for supplying corresponding polymeric materials to corresponding delivery channel arrangements having said tree construction with said L-shape branches.

REMARKS

The telephone election of Group I, claims 1-5 is hereby affirmed.

In response to the Examiners' suggestion in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the title has been amended to point out the elected invention.

In response to the objection set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, a new Abstract is attached to this Amendment on a separate sheet of paper.

In paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings. In response, Figs. 1 and 2 have been revised to point out that these Figures represent the prior art. Fig. 3 has been amended to insert reference character 24. In view of these amendments, it is requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

Claims 1-8 have been canceled and new claims 9-11 have been added to the application. New claims 9 to 11 clearly distinguish Applicant's invention over the prior art when the cited patents are considered either individually or in combination.

New claim 9 combines the substance of canceled claims 1 and 2. This claim points out that the channel arrangement of the melt blowing head branches include a substantially like L-shape wherein the polymeric material is held in each said branch for an equal holding time.

The feature that the polymeric material is held in each said branch for an equal holding time is not new matter because this is disclosed in Applicant's disclosure, e.g. page 10, line 11 et seq. This feature aids in providing a homogeneous distribution of the polymeric material in the melt-blowing head. The tree construction of canceled claim 5 is now recited in new main claim 9. New claim 10, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 3, recites the further feature of Applicant's melt-blowing head that the channel arrangement opens in two

secondary side branches also having an L-shape and size. Finally, new claim 11, which substantially corresponds to previous claim 5, recites now the further feature of Applicant's melt-blowing head that the blowing head comprises three different inlets for supplying corresponding polymeric materials to corresponding delivery channel arrangements having the tree construction according to claim 9 and the L-shape branches also according to claim 9. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection not be applied against the newly presented claims.

In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Allen '141.

Reconsideration is requested.

Allen '141 discloses in Figure 7 an adhesive dispensing die module for mounting on a manifold. This die module is an adhesive dispensing assembly and not a melt blowing head for making polymeric material fibrils for producing non-woven fabrics. Allen '141 discloses in figure 7 an inlet 87 with a plurality of channels defining branches which have a coat hanger design and not a tree design proper. Even admitting that the pattern shown in figure 7 would be a tree pattern, the branches of this pattern are not L-shaped and, starting from the inlet 87 and arriving at the die outlet holes, the branches define paths having very different lengths. Accordingly, the polymeric material in each said prior branch cannot be not held for a time equal to that for which the polymer material is held in any other branch. For these reasons, new claims 9-11 are not anticipated by Allen '141.

In paragraph 15 of the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Allen '141, Allen '848, further in view of Wells.

Reconsideration is requested.

Allen '141 has been distinguished from the claimed invention supra. Allen '848, on the other hand, discloses a melt blowing die system in which the several channels leading from the polymer inlet to the die outlet holes do not have an L-shape and are of different lengths. The polymer materials that are held in the

Allen '848 channels are not held for the same time periods as in the case of the claimed apparatus.

In this connection Applicant desires to draw the attention of the Examiner to the fact that Allen '141 and Allen '848 neither teach nor address how one may solve the problem of providing the same holding times for polymer materials for like holding times thereby providing the advantages which have been disclosed in the present application.

Wells describes a molding head where the branches are not of L-shaped, but have slanted portions such as 5, 6, 7 and 8 and vertical portions integral therewith. This configuration does not provide any L-shaped branches. In addition, Wells does not describe the concept of providing two secondary side branches having an L-shape as pointed out in new claim 10.

In paragraph 16 of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Allen '141, Allen '848 further in view of Choi.

Reconsideration is requested.

Allen '141 and Allen '848 have been distinguished from the claimed invention supra. The Choi patent fails to disclose any L-shaped branches of substantially equal length. For these reasons, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS:

HEDMAN & COSTIGAN, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-2601
(212) 302-8989

I hereby certify that this
correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service ☐
first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 6/23/03

